

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 21, 2004 (Paper No. 13). Claims 3 to 8, 12 to 13, 16 to 20, 23 to 32 and 34 to 45 are in the application, of which Claims 3, 16, 23, 28, 44 and 45 are independent. Claims 1 to 2, 9 to 11, 14, 15, 21 to 22 and 33 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter. Claims 3 to 7, 12, 16 to 19, 23 to 26, 28, 30, 34 to 39, 42 to 45 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Claims 1 and 2, 14, 15, 21 and 22 are cancelled and the remaining claims are being amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection are respectfully requested.

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication in the Office Action that Claim 33 is allowable. Independent Claims 28, 44 and 45 are being amended to substantially incorporate the limitations of Claim 33 and 31, from which Claim 33 depends. It is believed that Claims 28, 44 and 45 are patentable over the applied art.

Claims 1, 2, 6 to 11, 14, 15, 21, 22, 28 to 30, 41, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,548,722 (Jalalian), Claims 3, 16, 23 and 34 to 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jalalian and U.S. Patent No. 5,742,286 (Kung), Claims 4, 17, 24, 26, 27, 39, 40 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jalalian and U.S. Patent No. 5,926,463 (Ahearn), Claim 5, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 25, 37 and 38

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jalalian, Ahearn and Kung, Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jalalian, and Claims 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Jalalian and U.S. Patent No. 5,353,399 (Kuwamoto).

As indicated above, Claims 1 to 2, 9 to 11, 14, 15, 21 to 22 and 33 are cancelled, without concession as to the correctness of their rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

The present inventions concerns devices that are connected via a communication medium, and a display of icons representing device functions and the communication medium. One or more arbitrary combinations of functions of the devices are identified, and when it is judged that an arbitrary combination of functions of two or more of the devices is an effective combination, a virtual system configuration display means changes a display status of the icon for each function in the arbitrary combination to be different from display of other icons while the combination of functions is being executed.

By virtue of this arrangement, a user can be notified using a display such as that shown in Figures 11 and 33 of the present invention, as to the devices, and effective combinations of devices providing effective functionality.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 3 defines a data processing apparatus which can perform data communication with various devices connected on a predetermined communication medium. The apparatus comprises a first indication means, a first judgment means, and a virtual system configuration display means. The first indication means indicates one or more arbitrary combinations of

functions of plural peripheral device on the predetermined communication medium displayed on a display unit. The first judgment means judges effectiveness of an arbitrary combination of functions of two or more of the plural peripheral devices indicated by the first indication means. When it is judged by the first judgment means that the arbitrary combination of functions of the two or more peripheral devices provides effective functionality, the virtual system configuration display means changes a display status of the icon for each function in the arbitrary combination indicated by the first indication means different from display statuses of other icons while the combination of functions is being executed.

The Office Action indicates that Jalalian fails to show judging the effectiveness of an indicated combination and a visual system configuration display means changing the display status of the icon for each indicated function in the combination from the display status of other icons while the combination is being executed.

Jalalian is also not seen to show indicating one or more arbitrary combinations of functions of plural peripheral device on the predetermined communication medium displayed on a display unit, judging effectiveness of an arbitrary combination of functions of two or more of the plural peripheral devices indicated by the first indication means, and when it is judged that the arbitrary combination of functions provides effective functionality, the virtual system configuration display means changes a display status of the icon for each function in the arbitrary combination different from display statuses of other icons while the combination of functions is being executed.

Kung is not seen to remedy the noted deficiencies of Jalalian. The cited

portions of Kung are seen to describe a technique for installing software via a network using a drag and drop operation, with which one or more source objects, such as application programs and data files, are dragged and dropped onto a selection of one or more target objects, such as a hard drive of a computer system, to install the source object(s) on the target object(s). However, Kung is not seen to in anyway disclose or suggest judging the effectiveness of an indicated combination of functions of devices and/or changing the display status of the icon for each of the indicated functions of a combination during execution of the combination function.

The remaining applied art has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted above with respect to Jalalian and Kung.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 3 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 16 and 23, which have similar features to those of Claim 3, and are method and storage medium claims corresponding to Claim 3, are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to
our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Carole A. Quinn", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Carole A. Quinn
Registration No.: 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 83775v1